



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,160	03/01/2004	Mitchell B. Oliver	020294	3432
23696	7590	10/03/2011		
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED			EXAMINER	
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.			PATEL, DHAIRYA A	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2451	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/03/2011	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/791,160	OLIVER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DHAIRYA A. PATEL	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-4,6-8,10-15 and 17-25 is/are pending in the application.
  - 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-4,6-8,10-15 and 17-25 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/11/2011</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed on 8/11/2011. Claims 1-4,6-8,10-15,17-25 are subject to examination.
2. This amendment has been fully considered and entered.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 8/11/2011 was filed. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

3.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

***Claims 1-4,6-7,10-14,17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koskimies et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2004/0081110 (hereinafter Koskimies) in view of Bilange et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2004/0093595 (hereinafter Bilange)***

As per claim 1, Koskimies teaches a computer device (having wireless communication capability, comprising:

-a wireless communication portal for selectively sending and receiving data across a wireless network (Paragraph 50, 52, 66); **NOTE:** The reference teaches

having a WAP page of the sound download service at the content server which has midlets (i.e. sending/receiving data) and downloading a midlet across the network through infrared or Bluetooth functionality.

-a computer platform (Fig. 1 element 110) including a resident application environment and selectively download applications to the computer platform through the portal (Paragraph 50, 56, 59) the resident application environment configured to selectively download application (Paragraph 50,56) that comply with a predefined security protocol (Paragraph 78,79,80 ); **NOTE:** The reference teaches having mobile device (computer platform) which includes java “mobile information device applets (midlets)” which are downloaded through a WAP page of the sound download service (i.e. portal page). In Paragraph 59, it states selecting one or multiple midlets by the user to download at the mobile device (selectively download applications). In Paragraph 78, 79, 80, it teaches that downloading can be done by encrypting before downloading and decrypting by a particular target (i.e. comply with a predefined security protocol). According the specification of the current invention, it states applications are midlets or applets. Therefore, Koskimies teaches midlets/applets.

-a data store (i.e. content server or storage on the mobile device) in communication with the computer platform and selectively sending data to and receiving data from the computer platform (Paragraph 50, 53); **NOTE:** The reference teaches midlet will retrieve a list of available content items from the content server (i.e. data store) which is in communication with the mobile device. After selecting a content item (i.e. sound clip), the midlet can effect charging such as by sending an SMS and can

then download the content and immediately forward it to the limited device (selectively sending data to and receiving data from the computer platform).

- a download manager resident on the computer platform that at least selectively downloads applications through the portal that do not comply with the predefined security protocol (Paragraph 78, 83) **NOTE:** The reference states downloading content to a device unauthorized by the content creator, and downloading unauthorized content (i.e. unauthorized by the device maker) to the device i.e. downloading application that does not comply with the security protocol.

wherein the selectively downloaded applications that comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by the computer platform within the resident application environment (Paragraph 50, 59) **NOTE:** The reference teaches that the midlet is downloaded to the mobile device, the user can select one of the midlets via the mobile device and midlet is executed in the mobile device.

Koskimies does not teach wherein the selectively downloaded applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by the download manager outside of the resident application environment.

Bilange particularly points out a download manager resident on the computer platform that at least selectively downloads applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol (Paragraph 44-46) and wherein the selectively downloaded applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by the download manager outside of the resident application environment. (Paragraph 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching Koskimies's teaching to come up with downloading and executing application which does not comply with security protocol. The motivation for doing so would be sometimes downloading application which does not comply with security protocol are safe, therefore there is no harm to the user's computer in downloading them.

As per claim 2, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the device of claim 1, but Koskimies further teaches wherein the download manager (i.e. sound download service on the WAP page) exists within resident application environment and uses an existing application download interface (Paragraph 50, 66).

As per claim 3, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the device of claim 1, but Bilange further teaches wherein the wherein the download manager further manages executing the downloaded application that does not comply with the predefined security protocol is immediately executed (Paragraph 46).

As per claim 4, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the device of claim 1, but Koskimies further teaches wherein a downloaded application that does not comply with the predefined security protocol is stored (Paragraph 78, 83), and but Koskimies fails to teach the stored application is executed through the download manager. Bilange teaches the stored application is executed through the download manager (Paragraph 44-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching in Koskimies's teaching to come up with executing the application through download manager. The motivation

for doing so would be to test/verify the application by executing whether it is safe or malicious.

As per claim 6, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the device of claim 1, but Koskimies also teaches wherein the download manager further manages storage of the selectively downloaded application that do not comply with the predefined security protocol in the data store (Paragraph 83)

As per claim 7, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the device of claim 1, but Bilange further teaches wherein the predefined security protocol is verifying the origination of a given application to be downloaded (Paragraph 46).

As per claim 10, Koskimies teaches a computer device having wireless communication capability, comprising: a wireless communication means for selectively sending and receiving data across a wireless network (Paragraph 50, 52, 66); **NOTE:** The reference teaches having a WAP page of the sound download service at the content server which has midlets (i.e. sending/receiving data) and downloading a midlet across the network through infrared or Bluetooth functionality.

a computer means selectively downloading applications through the wireless communication means, the computer means configured to selectively download application (Paragraph 50,56) that comply with a predefined security protocol (Paragraph 78,79,80); **NOTE:** The reference teaches having mobile device (computer platform) which includes java “mobile information device applets (midlets)” which are downloaded through a WAP page of the sound download service (i.e. portal page). In Paragraph 78, 79, 80, it teaches that downloading can be done by encrypting before

downloading and decrypting by a particular target (i.e. comply with a predefined security protocol). According the specification of the current invention, it states applications are midlets or applets. Therefore, Koskimies teaches midlets/applets.

-a means for selectively downloading application through the wireless communications means that do no comply with the predefined security protocol (Paragraph 50, 78, 83) **NOTE:** The reference states downloading content to a device unauthorized by the content creator, and downloading unauthorized content (i.e. unauthorized by the device maker) to the device i.e. downloading application that does not comply with the security protocol. The downloading is done on the phone using infrared or Bluetooth communication (i.e. wireless communication)

wherein the selectively downloaded applications that comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by the computer platform within the resident application environment (Paragraph 50, 59) **NOTE:** The reference teaches that the midlet is downloaded to the mobile device, the user can select one of the midlets via the mobile device and midlet is executed in the mobile device.

Koskimies does not teach wherein the selectively downloaded applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by the download manager outside of the resident application environment.

Bilange particularly points out a download manager resident on the computer platform that at least selectively downloads applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol (Paragraph 44-46) and wherein the selectively downloaded applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by

the download manager outside of the resident application environment. (Paragraph 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching Koskimies's teaching to come up with downloading and executing application which does not comply with security protocol. The motivation for doing so would be sometimes downloading application which does not comply with security protocol are safe, therefore there is no harm to the user's computer in downloading them.

As per claim 11, Koskimies teaches a method of selectively downloading through a wireless connection to a computer device, comprising the steps of: downloading from the wireless connection to the computer platform of the computer device an application that does not comply with a predefined security protocol for use at that computer device (Paragraph 50, 78, 83) **NOTE:** The reference states downloading content to a device unauthorized by the content creator, and downloading unauthorized content (i.e. unauthorized by the device maker) to the device i.e. downloading application that does not comply with the security protocol. The downloading is done on the phone using infrared or Bluetooth communication (i.e. wireless communication)

-the computer platform including a resident application environment for downloading applications utilizing a predefined security protocol for at least downloading an application (Paragraph 50, 53, 59), the downloading of the non-complying application occurring through the use of a download manager resident on the computer platform; (Paragraph 78, 83) and for executing applications downloaded in compliance with the predefined security protocol within the resident application

environment(Paragraph 50, 59) **NOTE:** The reference teaches having mobile device (computer platform) which includes java “mobile information device applets (midlets)” which are downloaded through a WAP page of the sound download service (i.e. portal page). In Paragraph 59, it states selecting one or multiple midlets by the user to download at the mobile device (selectively download applications). In Paragraph 78, 79, 80, it teaches that downloading can be done by encrypting before downloading and decrypting by a particular target (i.e. comply with a predefined security protocol). According the specification of the current invention, it states applications are midlets or applets. Therefore, Koskimies teaches midlets/applets. The reference teaches that the midlet is downloaded to the mobile device, the user can select one of the midlets via the mobile device and midlet is executed in the mobile device.

Although Koskimies teaches an application that does not comply with a predefined security protocol (Paragraph 78, 83), But Koskimies does not teach executing the non-complying application at the computer device with the download manager outside of the resident application environment. Bilange explicitly points out that downloading from a wireless connection to a computer platform of the computer device an application that does not comply with a predefined security protocol for use at that computer device (Paragraph 44, 46) and the downloading of the non-complying application occurring through the use of a download manager resident on the computer platform (Paragraph 44, 46) executing the non-complying application at the computer device with the download manager outside of the resident application environment (Paragraph 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching in Koskimies's teaching to come up with downloading application which does not comply with security protocol. The motivation for doing so would be sometimes downloading application which does not comply with security protocol are safe, therefore there is no harm to the user's computer in downloading them

As per claim 12, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the method of claim 11, but Koskimies further teaches wherein the download manager (i.e. sound download service on the WAP page) exists within resident application environment and the step of downloading uses an existing application download interface (Paragraph 50, 66).

As per claim 13, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the method of claim 11, but Bilange further teaches further comprising the steps of: storing, with the download manager the non-complying application (Paragraph 44) and executing the stored application through the download manager (Paragraph 46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching in Koskimies's teaching to come up with executing the application through download manager. The motivation for doing so would to test/verify the application by executing whether it is safe or malicious.

As per claim 14, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the method of claim 11, but Bilange further teaches further comprising the step of verifying whether the non-complying application complies with the predefined security protocol (Paragraph 46, 59-60)

As per claim 17, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the method of claim 11, but Bilange further teaches further comprising the step of downloading the download manager to the computer platform of the computer device after a request to download the non-complying application has been made (Paragraph 44, 46), and prior to the step of downloading the non-complying application (Paragraph 42, 44).

As per claim 18, Koskimies teaches a method of selectively downloading through a wireless connection to a computer device comprising the steps of: a step for downloading through the wireless communication to the computer platform of the computer device an application that does not comply with a predefined security protocol for use within a resident application environment at that computer device (Paragraph 50, 78, 83) **NOTE:** The reference states downloading content to a device unauthorized by the content creator, and downloading unauthorized content (i.e. unauthorized by the device maker) to the device i.e. downloading application that does not comply with the security protocol. The downloading is done on the phone using infrared or Bluetooth communication (i.e. wireless communication)

-a step for executing the downloaded application at the computer device outside of the resident application environment (Paragraph 78, 83).

-wherein application that comply with the pre-defined security protocol are configured for execution within the resident application environment (Paragraph 50, 59)  
**NOTE:** The reference teaches that the midlet is downloaded to the mobile device, the user can select one of the midlets via the mobile device and midlet is executed in the mobile device.

Although Koskimies teaches downloading through the wireless communication to a computer platform of the computer device an application that does not comply with a predefined security protocol for use within a resident application environment at that computer device but Bilange further teaches downloading through the wireless communication to a computer platform of the computer device an application that does not comply with a predefined security protocol for use within a resident application environment at that computer device (Paragraph 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching gin Koskimies's teaching to come up with downloading application which does not comply with security protocol. The motivation for doing so would be sometimes downloading application which does not comply with security protocol are safe, therefore there is no harm to the user's computer in downloading them.

As per claim 19, it teaches same limitation as claim 11, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 20, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the non-transitory computer-readable medium of claim 19, but Koskimies further teaches wherein the download manager (i.e. sound download service on the WAP page) is resident on the computer platform (Paragraph 50)

As per claim 21, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the non-transitory computer-readable medium of claim 19, but Bilange further teaches wherein the download manager is loaded to the computer platform after a request to download of the non-

complying application (Paragraph 44, 46) and prior to download thereof (Paragraph 42, 44)

As per claim 22, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the computer device of claim 1, but Koskimies further teaches wherein the download manager exists within resident application environment and uses an existing application download interface (Paragraph 50, 56)

As per claim 23, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the computer device of claim 1, but Koskimies further teaches wherein the pre-defined security protocol includes an application validation requirement of the resident application environment (Paragraph 79-81)

As per claim 24, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the computer device of claim 1, but Koskimies further teaches wherein the application being downloaded by the resident application environment in compliance with the pre-defined security protocol (Paragraph 79-81) and the application being downloaded by the download manager in non-compliance with the pre-defined security protocol are both stored in the data store (Paragraph 78, 83).

***Claims 8, 15, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koskimies et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2004/0081110 (hereinafter Koskimies) in view of Bilange et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2004/0093595 (hereinafter Bilange) further in view of Hericourt et al. U.S. Patent # 7,099,916 (hereinafter Hericourt)***

As per claim 8, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the device of claim 1, but fails to further teach wherein the predefined security protocol is verifying the presence of a certificate within a given application to be downloaded. Hericourt teaches wherein the predefined security protocol is verifying the presence of a certificate within a given application to be downloaded (column 10 lines 11-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Hericourt's teaching in Koskimies and Bilange's teaching to come up with verifying the presence of certificate within a given application to be downloaded. The motivation for doing so would be to verify the identity of the application/file and make sure the it is virus free, thereby the certificate provides a virus-free certificate.

As per claim 15, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the method of claim 14, but fails to teach wherein the step of verifying includes verifying the presence or absence of a certificate within the non-complying application. Hericourt teaches verifying the nature of the downloaded application is verifying the presence or absence of a certificate within the non-complying application (column 10 lines 11-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Hericourt's teaching in Koskimies and Bilange's teaching to come up with verifying the presence of certificate within the downloaded application. The motivation for doing so would be to verify the identity of the application/file and make sure the it is virus free, thereby the certificate provides a virus-free certificate.

As per claim 25, Koskimies and Bilange teaches the computer device of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the predefined security protocol is configured to

protect the computer device. Hericourt teaches the predefined security protocol is configured to protect the computer device (column 7 lines 10-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Hericourt's teaching in Koskimies's and Bilange's teaching to come up with having predefined security protocol is configured to protect the computer device. The motivation for doing so would be so that file/application with the virus would not be downloaded thereby preventing infecting the workstation.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A). Applicant states Koskimies and Bilange does not teach "download manager...that is configured to selectively download applications...that do not comply with the predefined security protocol" and "wherein selectively downloaded application taht do no comply with the predefined security protocol are executed...outside of the resident environment".

In regards w/ remark A, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in Paragraph 44-46, Bilange teaches download manager resident on the computer platform that at least selectively downloads applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol (Paragraph 44-46) and wherein the selectively downloaded applications that do not comply with the predefined security protocol are executed by the download manager outside of the resident application environment. (Paragraph 44-46). Bilange teaches applications compatible with user's mobile device

are presented to the user by the portal/OTA server (download manager resident on the computer platform). The application provisioning server determines the appropriate download scenario for the user's mobile device and can choose a suitable user identification, download and licensing strategy to use for provisioning application (Paragraph 44). In Paragraph 45, Bilange teaches application is downloaded (selectively downloading applications). At this point, the unlock code is not obtained by the mobile device this means the application is downloaded that does not comply with the predefined security protocol. The provisioning server takes control of the registered application on the first launch to get an unlock code that will be stored in the mobile device. This means the application is downloaded first and then the unlock code is stored in the mobile device, which means the application is downloaded which do not comply with the security protocol at the download time (do not comply with the security protocol). In Paragraph 46, it teaches the registered MIDP application, when a user starts the registered application on the mobile device, the Java application manager loads the application (execution of the application outside of the resident application environment) and the application provisioning server takes control to perform any validation that may be defined by various subclasses of RegisteredMIDlet. and the download may be initiated from WAP. The application is loaded by the Java application manager this means the execution is outside of the resident application environment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bilange's teaching Koskimies's teaching to come up with downloading and executing application which does not comply with

security protocol. The motivation for doing so would be sometimes downloading application which does not comply with security protocol are safe, therefore there is no harm to the user's computer in downloading them.

B). Applicant states there is not apparent reason for Hericourt to be combined with Koskimies and/or Bilange to achieve "wherein the predefined security protocol is configured to protect the computer device".

As per remark B, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, because in column 7 lines 10-34, Hericourt teaches the predefined security protocol is configured to protect the computer device (column 7 lines 10-34). Hericourt teaches client workstation downloads both the file and associated virus-free certificate in a directory and asks its anti-virus program to check the file. The checking and verification is required in the client workstation for determining whether the file is virus-free or not, thereby to protect the computer (predefined security protocol to protect the computer device). Examiner would like to point out that the reason or motivation for combination is so that file/application with the virus would not be downloaded thereby preventing infecting the workstation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Hericourt's teaching in Koskimies's and Bilange's teaching to come up with having predefined security protocol is configured to protect the computer device. The motivation for doing so would be so that file/application with the virus would not be downloaded thereby preventing infecting the workstation.

***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A). Kiessling et al. U.S. Patent # 6,901,251

B). Stillerman et al. U.S. patent # 7,467,417

5. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairy A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM-5:30PM, first Fridays OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DAP

/John Follansbee/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451